film exhibits a peak deviated from that which stands for a single crystal of the semiconductor.

5. (amended) A device for sensing a light produced by a process comprising the steps of:

depositing a semiconductor material on a substrate;

forming a photoelectric conversion semiconductor device on said substrate comprising a p-type impurity semiconductor region, an intrinsic semiconductor region, and an n-type impurity semiconductor region, a semiconductor region of said photoelectric conversion semiconductor device being made of said semiconductor material; and

forming a thin film transistor on said substrate which constitutes an electric circuit required to [sense a light] <u>drive said photoelectric conversion semiconductor device</u>, a semiconductor region of said thin film transistor being made of said semiconductor material;

wherein said semiconductor regions are arranged in order with said p-type impurity semiconductor region adjacent said intrinsic semiconductor region and said intrinsic semiconductor region adjacent said n-type impurity semiconductor region in said photoelectric conversion semiconductor device, said order being in a direction perpendicular to that in which a light to be sensed is incident thereon.

REMARKS

The Examiner's Action dated September 11, 1997 has been received and its contents carefully noted. In view thereof, the specification, as well as claims 1 and 5, have been amended in order to better define that which applicant regards as the invention. As previously, claims 1-28 are presently pending in the instant application.

Initially, applicant wishes to note the Examiner's indication in paragraphs five and seven of the Office Action that claims 5-7 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 and that claims 8-28 are in proper condition for allowance over the prior art of record as presently submitted.

With reference now to paragraph one of the Office Action, the disclosure has been objected to as including minor informalities. As can be seen from the foregoing amendments, the specification has been reviewed and amended in accordance with the suggestions set forth by the Examiner as well as others. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that applicant's specification, as presently amended, is in proper formal condition for allowance.

With reference to paragraph two of the Office Action, claims 1-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, in that the specification, while being enabling for semi-amorphous material, does not reasonably provide enablement for a mixture of amorphous and crystalline structures. Again, as can be seen from the foregoing amendments, claim 1 has been amended in order to delete reference to the semiconductor layer as being a structure comprising a mixture of amorphous and crystalline structures. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as well as those claims which depend therefrom, are now in proper formal condition for allowance.

With reference now to paragraphs three and four of the Office Action, claims 5-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner states that claim 5 recites a PIN photoelectric conversion element at lines 4-8, but also recites a thin film transistor as sensing light at line 10. Again, as can be seen from the foregoing amendments, claim 5 has been amended at line 10 to recite a step of forming a thin film transistor on said substrate which constitutes an electric circuit required to drive said photoelectric

conversion semiconductor device. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 5, as well as those claims which depend therefrom, are now in proper formal condition for allowance.

With reference now to paragraph eight of the Office Action, the Examiner has stated that the reissue declaration fails to address all of the changes made by applicant. Each change represents an acknowledgement of error and should be referred to in the declaration as set forth by MPEP §1414 and §1444. In this regard, it is unclear from the Examiner's rejection what change applicant has made to the claims which has not been referred to in the declaration.

Particularly, the paragraph bridging pages two and three of the declaration recites that applicant did not appreciate the fact that the inventive combination is applicable not only to a device for sensing an image, but more broadly to a device for sensing a light. Accordingly, claims 1-14 have been amended in order to recite a device for sensing a light and further referred to a light rather than an image throughout the several claims. Additionally, applicant did not appreciate the limiting nature of defining the semiconductor layer as being a semi-amorphous structure. Again, applicant's declaration specifically refers to this error being corrected by deleting reference to semi-amorphous in the claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that applicant's declaration complies with MPEP §1414 and §1444 and refers to every change made therein. However, should the Examiner maintain his objection to the reissue declaration, a supplemental reissue declaration will be provided and the Examiner's input as to the particular change not referred to therein would be appreciated.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the objections and rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that claims 1-28 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner believe a conference would be of benefit in expediting the prosecution of the instant application, he is hereby invited to telephone counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald R. Studebaker
Reg. No. 32,815

Sixbey, Friedman, Leedom & Ferguson, P.C.
2010 Corporate Ridge, Suite 600
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 790-9110